

**REMARKS**

Entry of the present amendment and reconsideration of the subject application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

The Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the indication of the allowability of claim 10. By the present amendment claim 10 is rewritten in independent form and also to address some clarity issues as discussed below.

The present amendment provides the clarity that is desired by the Examiner. Specifically, the drawings, and correspondingly the specification, are amended to include an indication of the air inlet (new reference number 26). See that the paragraph beginning at page 3, line 20, of the specification had provided a discussion of the air inlet 26. However, there was a need for a reference to the drawings for the air inlet 26. The present amendment thus addresses the desire of the Examiner. Also, the amendment provides section headings within the specification as required on page 3 of the Office action. Lastly, the Examiner identified that there was confusion in the claims since it is actually the air stream that can be blocked and not the fan housing or the blower tube and that there might be confusion as to where blockage could occur to be an issue. Claim 1 (and claim 10 since is rewritten to be independent) is amended to provide this clarification. The air stream flow and what happens upon blockage are clarified for the Examiner. Claims 6 and 7 are amended to provide clarity as requested (see page 5). As such, the concerns of the Examiner are addressed. Accordingly, it is requested that the respective objections and rejections be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection based upon newly cited Salisian (USPN 6,305,048), the rejection is respectfully traversed.

A brief recap of the Salisian structure would be beneficial. First, it must be realized that the Salisian document is a bit cryptic and thus is rather sketchy as to exactly what is being disclosed/taught to a person of ordinary skill in the art. However, it appears that at best, Salisian is teaching to bleed-off only a portion of the overall airflow and send the bled-off portion to cool the motor. Please see Fig. 2, which shows an intake aperture 52 for letting some, but not all of the air flow to cool the motor. Specifically, note that most of the flow arrows at the intake plenum 30 are proceeding toward the impeller and only a single flow arrow is proceeding through the intake aperture 30. This bifurcation of flow is clearly stated within the Salisian patent at Col. 4, lines 6 and 7 (i.e., the path for cooling is parallel to the path proceeding to the impeller 40).

Turning to the claims, claim 1 clearly states “the air stream from the air inlet in the casing (11) to the fan inlet (23) cools the engine (20) and components inside the casing (11) before it enters the fan inlet (23).” In Salisian, the air cooling the motor 50 proceeds along the different path and it does not enter the fan portion (i.e., the impeller 40). The bifurcation of the air in Salisian for the parallel paths prevents satisfaction of the limitation concerning cooling before entering the fan. In other words, there are two different air streams in the Salisian device (one cooling the motor 50 and one proceeding to the impeller 40).

Next, it should be appreciated that the clarification about the blockage of the air stream also provides clarification concerning the Examiner interpretation of Salisian. Specifically, the Examiner states that air can pass over the motor via the aperture 52 regardless of what is happening with the impeller/tube. Again, this points to the bifurcation of air flow along two, parallel paths. However, now that the path of flow is clear, the use of Salisian based upon the possible interpretation due to clarity should be removed.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby

Appl. No. 10/578,160  
Amdt. Dated July 8, 2011  
Reply to Office action of April 26, 2011

requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ABE1-40373.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Ronald M. Kachmarik/  
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Ste. 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
216-579-1700

Date: July 8, 2011